



## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/686,007	10/10/2000	Donald J. Palmer	10006545-1	4378
7590 07/29/2004			EXAMINER	
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY			THOMPSON, MARC D	
Intellectual Property Administration P.O. Box 272400			ART UNIT PAPER NUMBE	
Fort Collins, Co	-	,	2144	

DATE MAILED: 07/29/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



	Application No.	Applicant(s)	v
Advisory Action	09/686,007	PALMER ET AL.	
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Marc D. Thompson	2144	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence addi	ress
THE REPLY FILED 21 June 2004 FAILS TO PLACE TH Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to av final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may <u>only</u> be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applica a timely filed amendment whicl	ation. A proper reply h places the applica	/ to a tion in
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the condition of the con	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF The date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the main attention of the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the main attention of the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the main attention.	g date of the final rejection HE FINAL REJECTION. R 1.136(a) and the apprount of the fee. The appropriationally set in the final of	on. See MPEP  opriate extension opriate extension Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF	R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal o		,
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be			
(a) they raise new issues that would require further		see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	· ·		
(c)  they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or			
(d) they present additional claims without canceling	ng a corresponding number of fi	inally rejected claims	<b>S</b> .
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .			
<ol><li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejecti</li></ol>	on(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed a	amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because:		dered but does NO	f place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were	enewly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			nd an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-22</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a)□ approved or b)□ disapp	roved by the Examir	ner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	nt(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	·	
10. Other:	Mal	RC D. THOMPS RC THOMPS MARY EXAMI	SON

## Continuation of 2.

NOTE: Minimally, the combination of the use of cost/consumable requirement data for scheduling print job(s) with the entirety of individual limitation(s) set forth in each dependent claim have not been properly searched together. That is, the new combinations of limitations now present in the dependent claim(s) have not been searched or treated in prior actions. Further, the proposed amendments fail to reduce or define any issues suitable for appeal or discussion beyond a general allegation that the previously set forth dependent claim(s) are not expressly provided by the prior art of record as applied in the final action mailed 4/20/2004. It is also noted that these newly presented independent claims stand rejected in the final action. Again, the newly formed combinations of limitations now present in the dependent claims have not been properly searched or treated, and would require further search and consideration to properly discern/determine patentability.

MARC D. THOMPSON
MRC THOMPSON
PRIMARY EXAMINER